



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/643,350

08/19/2003

James V. Browning

STL 13101.10 (SEAG
77857

3802

35810

7590

08/09/2006

PIETRAGALLO, BOSICK & GORDON LLP
ONE OXFORD CENTRE, 38TH FLOOR
301 GRANT STREET
PITTSBURGH, PA 15219-6404

EXAMINER

DOAN, DUC T

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2188

DATE MAILED: 08/09/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/643,350	Applicant(s) BROWNING, JAMES V.	
	Examiner Duc T. Doan	Art Unit 2188	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 May 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 16-39 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 16-39 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Status of Claims

Claims 1-39 have been presented for examination in this application. In response to the last Office Action, The specification has been amended. Claims 1-15 have been cancelled, claims 16,22,24,31 have been amended, and claims 32-39 have been added. As the result, claims 16-39 are now pending in this application.

Claims 16-39 are rejected.

Applicant's arguments filed 5/19/06 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Therefore, the rejections from the previous office action are respectfully maintained, with changes as needed to address the amendments

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(a) the invention was known or used by other's in this country or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Art Unit: 2188

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

Claims 16-17,23,32-34 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 (e) as being anticipated by Narayanaswami (US 6980175)

As in claim 16, Narayanaswami discloses a method for accessing personal information, comprising:
storing personal information of a user on a storage device comprising a solid-state memory device (Narayanaswami's Fig 1: #19 slot to accept a solid state memory device; column 3 lines 1-2; column 6 lines 25-60 teaches the storage device is used to store personal information of a user), interfacing the storage device with a host computing device (Narayanaswami's Fig 1 shows interfacing with host computer #21); and using information in the storage device to reconfigure interface settings in the host computing device (Narayanaswami's column 6 lines 25-60 teaches the personalized data such as preference and customization associated with the user are used to reconfigure interface setting in the host computer).

As in claim 17, Narayanaswami discloses wherein storing personal information comprises storing at least one of contact information, scheduling information, account information, medical information, application files, entertainment features, photographs, Internet

Art Unit: 2188

settings and favorites, computer applications, and interface preferences (Narayanaswami's column 3 lines 1-20; column 6 lines 5-60).

As in claim 23, Narayanaswami discloses interfacing the storage device with the host computing device comprises interfacing the storage device with the host computing device via a wireless communication (column 3 lines 10-20).

As in claim 32, Narayanaswami discloses receiving information stored on the storage device with the host computing device (see Narayanaswami's column 4 lines 15-31; column 6 lines 25-60).

As in claim 33, the claim rejected based on the same rationale as in the rejection of claim 16.

Claim 34 rejected based on the same rationale as of claim 17.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 18,35 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Narayanaswami (US 6980175) as applied to claims 16,33 respectively and in view of Wright et al (US 2002/0046061).

As in claim 18, Narayanaswami does not disclose expressly personal information comprises storing a user medical history including at least one of X-ray images and test results. However, Wright discloses a device, which stores personal medical information including x-ray images, medical history (see Wright's paragraph 13). Narayanaswami and Wright are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor, namely storing personal information. At the time of invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the personal data containing medical history, x-ray images, and lab-reports of Wright into the system of Narayanaswami and thereby to provide greater versatility to the system of Narayanaswami.

Claim 35 rejected based on the same rationale as of claim 18.

Claims 19-21,36-38 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Narayanaswami (US 6980175), as applied to claim 16 and in view of Morochove (A quantum lap forward in storage capacity).

As in claims 19-20, the claims recites wherein storing personal information comprises storing personal information on a storage device having a storage capacity of at least 2 gigabytes (claim 19); personal information comprises storing personal information on a storage device having a storage capacity of at least 10 gigabytes (claim 20). Narayanaswami discloses a personal device, capable of accepting external storage device such as flash compact, micro drives

Art Unit: 2188

etc.. with sizes of at least 340 Mbytes. Narayanaswami does not expressly disclose the claim's external storage size of at least 2GByte. However, Morochove describes an external storage device with capacity of at least 10 Gbytes being stored at atomic scale. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to include the high density storage device as suggested by Morochove in Narayanaswami's system thereby to allow higher capacity storage device that can be attached to a portable device of Narayanaswami (see Morochove's page 1, 2nd paragraph).

As in claim 21 the claim recites personal information comprises storing personal information on a storage device having width, length, and thickness dimensions of no Feature than approximately 1.75 inches, 1.5 inches, and 0.125 inches, respectively. The claim is rejected based on the same rationale as in the rejection of claim 20. Morochove further discloses the atomic scale storage device is readily to be packaged into device so tiny such as size of quarter that can be used in devices such as personal digital applicant (palm size device etc..).

Claim 36 rejected based on the same rationale as of claim 19.

Claim 37 rejected based on the same rationale as of claim 20.

Claim 38 rejected based on the same rationale as of claim 21.

Claim 22 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Narayanaswami (US 6980175) as applied to claim 16 and in view of Vogt et al (US 2004/0078511).

As in claim 22, Narayanaswami does not disclose partitioning the personal information so that a portion of the information can be accessed without a password or personal identification number and another portion of the information requires a password or personal identification

Art Unit: 2188

number to access the stored information. However, Vogt discloses a Main flash array 105 that may be accessed without a password and a hidden storage that may only be accessed via access control (fig 1; column 2, paragraph 15). Narayanaswami and Vogt are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor, namely storage devices. At the time of invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the access controlled hidden storage along with the main array storage without access control of Vogt into the system of Narayanaswami, thereby to provide stronger security to the hidden storage partition into storage system of Narayanaswami's (to provide stronger security, hardware needs to be added to perform some of the security functions; Vogt's paragraph 4, column 1).

Claims 24-25,31 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Narayanaswami (US 6980175) in view of Vogt et al (US 2004/0078511).

As in claim 24, the claim rejected based on the same rationale as in the rejection of claims 16 and 22.

Claim 25 rejected based on the same rationale as of claim 17.

Claim 31 rejected based on the same rationale as of claim 22.

Claim 26 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Narayanaswami (US 6980175), Vogt et al (US 2004/0078511) as applied to claim 24 and in view of Wright et al (US 2002/0046061).

Claim 26 rejected based on the same rationale as of claim 18.

Art Unit: 2188

Claims 27-30 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Narayanaswami (US 6980175), Vogt et al (US 2004/0078511) as applied to claim 24 and in view of Morochove (A quantum lap forward in storage capacity).

Claim 27 rejected based on the same rationale as of claim 19.

Claim 28 rejected based on the same rationale as of claim 20.

Claim 29 rejected based on the same rationale as of claim 21.

Claim 30 rejected based on the same rationale as of claim 20.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

When responding to the office action, Applicant is advised to provide the examiner with the line numbers and page numbers in the application and/or references cited to assist examiner to locate the appropriate paragraphs.

Art Unit: 2188

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Duc T. Doan whose telephone number is 571-272-4171. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:00 AM 05:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mano Padmanabhan can be reached on 571-272-4210. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Mano Padmanabhan
5/6/06